

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,552	09/05/2003	Martina Fitz	J&J-1975 DIV	8177
27777	7590 12/07/2005		EXAMINER	
PHILIP S. JOHNSON			GOFF II, JOHN L	
JOHNSON & JOHNSON ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA		4	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW BRUN	SWICK, NJ 08933-7003	3	1733	

DATE MAILED: 12/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	U
	10/656,552	FITZ, MARTINA	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	John L. Goff	1733	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	*-
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DESTANCISE OF THE MAILING DESTANCISE OF THE MONTHS From the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN 136(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO te, cause the application to become A	ICATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communic BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 S	September 2003.		
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ Thi	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa			ts is
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 33-42 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 33-42 are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to e drawing(s) be held in abeya ction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.12	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	nts have been received. Its have been received in a prity documents have been au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage	;
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)	
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 	

Application/Control Number: 10/656,552 Page 2

Art Unit: 1733

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 33-41, drawn to a method of producing a handling aid, classified in class
 264, subclass 299.
- II. Claim 42, drawn to a method of using a handling aid, classified in class 53, subclass 396.
- 2. Inventions I and II are related as independent inventions, each having a unique and separate means for establishing patentability. Invention I is directed to a method of producing a handling aid whereas Invention II is directed to a method of using a handling aid. Invention I does not require the use as detailed by Invention II and Invention II does not require the formation as detailed in Invention I.
- 3. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 4. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 5. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

In the event Group I is elected applicant is required to elect one of the following

Species:

Species I (appears to read on claims 33-35) directed to producing the handling aid by coating.

Species II (appears to read on claims 36-41) directed to producing the handling aid by thermal bonding.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, there are no generic claims.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the

Art Unit: 1733

examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

6. A telephone call was made to applicants representative on 11/17/05 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made as the examiner was unable to reach applicants representative.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **John L. Goff** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-1216**. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:15 AM - 3:45 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on (571) 272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John L. Goff

JEFF H. AFTERGUT PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1300